

The Woman's Column.

VOL. XIV.

NEW YORK AND BOSTON, FEBRUARY 23, 1901.

No. 4.

The Woman's Column.

Published Fortnightly at 3 Park Street, Boston, Mass.

EDITOR:

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

Subscription . . . 25 cents per annum.

Advertising Rates . . . 25 cents per line.

Entered as second class matter at the Boston, Mass Post Office, Jan. 18, 1888.

MASSACHUSETTS SUFFRAGE HEARING.

No legislative hearing in Boston this year has called out so large an attendance as that on woman suffrage, held Feb. 18. The crush was unprecedented. The Joint Committee on Constitutional Amendments adjourned the hearing from Room 431 to the largest committee room in the State House, but even this proved wholly inadequate. Every inch of standing room was packed, a dense crowd extended far out into the hall, and hundreds were turned away. Those members of the committee who came late had to reach their seats by walking up the room on top of the long table. The solid mass of people, mostly women, stood patiently for two hours and a half to listen to the speeches. This unusual attendance was largely due to the wish to hear our National President, Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt; but the crowd must have been an object lesson to any one who had fancied that interest in equal suffrage was dying out.

Mrs. Maud Wood Park, the newly-elected chairman of the State Board of Directors of the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association, conducted the hearing for the petitioners, with much ability. Mr. Thomas Russell, as usual, appeared for the remonstrants. The speakers in the affirmative were Mrs. Catt, Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead, Mrs. Helen Campbell, Mr. J. P. Dresser, Miss Maud Thompson, and Miss Alice Stone Blackwell; in the negative, Mrs. Robert W. Lord, Mrs. W. T. Sedgwick, Miss Frances J. Dyer, Miss Mary E. Corbett, whose paper was read by Mrs. Barrett Wendell, Mrs. Chas. Lamson, and Mrs. A. J. George.

On February 20 a hearing was given by the Committee on Election Laws to the petitioners that municipal suffrage be granted to tax-paying women. Again the hearing had to be adjourned to the largest committee room.

This bill was not asked for by the Massachusetts W. S. A., but by a number of individuals who favor the measure. Several prominent members spoke in the affirmative, while a pamphlet in the negative, by one of the auditors of the Association, Mr. Richard P. Hallowell, was distributed at the door.

Hon. George A. O. Ernst conducted the hearing for the petitioners. The speakers were Mr. Henry B. Blackwell, Mr. Ernst, Mrs. Nelson Titus of Quincy, Mrs. Otto B.

Co'e of Boston, Mrs. Anna Christy Fall of Malden, and Miss Alice Stone Blackwell of Dorchester. Mr. Thomas Russell conducted the hearing for the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women, and the speakers were Mrs. Robert W. Lord, Mr. Frank Foxcroft, of Cambridge, Dr. Lyman Abbott, of New York, and Dr. Edward M. Hartwell.

A hearing was given before the same committee on the same morning, on the petition for a bill enabling women who have the right to vote for school committee to vote in the caucus on the nomination of candidates for school committee. The M. A. O. F. E. S. W. protested officially against this measure of simple justice.

A full report of the suffrage hearings will be given in the *Woman's Journal* of Feb. 23d and March 2d. Send 10 cents and receive them postpaid. The speeches of the remonstrants will some day be studied with curiosity and amusement by the historian, as we now smile over the old-time arguments against women's education and property rights.

MRS. MEAD ON SUFFRAGE.

Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead said at the recent legislative hearing on Woman Suffrage in Massachusetts:

I hold that suffrage is not a natural right for either men or women. I think it is to be granted always under conditions, and under such educational qualifications as obtain in Massachusetts. I hold that democracy has two functions; it is to do two things. First, and most important, it is to produce the best kind of voters; it is to make intelligent, self-acting agents. Secondly, it is to give us a moral, well-ordered government. Democracy has sometimes failed in the latter; it has never failed in the first where it has been fairly tried. We have at present only a partial democracy. No doubt at Moscow or St. Petersburg you will find better police service than in New York or Chicago. I suppose the streets look cleaner. It is easy to do many things under an autocratic government that cannot be done so easily under a democracy. But then we must not judge a democracy always by the government of our great cities. Compare the average American man, who has had the vote for a hundred years, not merely with the average Russian, but with the cultivated Russian. The average American may not speak so many languages and may not possess so much technical knowledge, but he is far better posted on matters of finance, social science and government. There is no country in the world where so many books are being studied on finance, social science and government. This is what suffrage has done for men, and I ask for suffrage, first and foremost, because I want it to do the same thing for women, and, secondly, because I believe eventually it will bring better government. An autocratic government can do some things that a democratic government has not yet done, but when we have a fully democratic government I believe we shall have the best form of government.

We must remember how recently the suffrage has been extended to the men of America. In England there has been no popular suffrage to speak of until within comparatively few years. As late as 1868, four million men in England out of five million were disfranchised. The extension of the suffrage in England, France and Germany has resulted in a continual uplift of the people, and also in better government; but first and foremost of all, in better people.

I believe when we have responsibility we shall do much better work. I worked hard last year in reference to the school committee, because I could vote for them; but I did nothing in regard to the council and aldermen, because I had no responsibility. When the time comes that I can vote for the council and aldermen, I shall do my utmost to be just as faithful with regard to them as I was with regard to the school committee. As we gradually extend this sense of responsibility, which will come with the placing of responsibility, we shall not find so many of our now leisure class of women sitting around and finding time to play whist on Monday morning.

The silliest argument ever presented against suffrage is that women have more influence without it. There is not one scintilla of evidence that woman would have less influence if she had the ballot. If a woman is going to influence her husband, she must know what she is talking about. If I say to my husband, "Now I want you to do the right thing and vote the right way, but I don't know the first thing about it myself; I don't know anything about the candidates or about the issues," how much influence am I going to have? When we grant suffrage to women we are not going to see the millennium, we are not going to see better government at once, but we are going to see the benefits that result from increased responsibility, a greater breadth and sympathy, and gradually a much better government.

LETTER FROM SEC. LONG'S DAUGHTER.

Miss Margaret Long of Colorado Springs, daughter of the Secretary of the Navy, writes of equal suffrage in Colorado:

The women of Colorado are a power in State politics. They have always cast their votes for the candidate of highest principle and best moral character. It is very simple to register and cast a ballot, and it cannot be said that voting demands a great deal of a woman's time. The women who vote in Colorado are the educated and refined women, and they, with many men who originally voted against extending the suffrage, admit that it is a success.

Mrs. Evangeline Heartz recently acted as speaker of the Colorado House of Representatives for a whole day. The regular speaker desired to take part in an exciting debate that was before the House, and called Mrs. Heartz to the chair. Many difficult parliamentary points came up for decision, but Mrs. Heartz proved equal to all emergencies, and preserved good order.

VICE IN THE PHILIPPINES.

In view of the severe criticisms made during the debate in the U. S. Senate upon the alleged drunkenness and licentiousness in the Philippines, and the introduction of the European system of the State regulation of vice, Adjutant-General Corbin recently cabled General MacArthur at Manila:

Are houses of prostitution licensed, protected, or in any way encouraged by the military authorities?

General MacArthur replied:

Houses of prostitution are not licensed, protected, or encouraged.

The President afterwards transmitted to the Senate a report of the Secretary of War, enclosing the report of the Taft Philippine Commission. Appended to the secretary's report are two cablegrams. One from Secretary Root, dated Jan. 15, addressed to Judge Taft, asks various questions about the liquor question in Manila, and closes with the following inquiry:

Are houses of prostitution licensed, protected, or in any way encouraged by authorities?

The second telegram, dated Jan. 17, is from Judge Taft and the Philippine Commission. In answer to the closing question, they say:

No; but true that in November, 1898, spread of venereal diseases among soldiers led military authorities, in order to maintain effectiveness of army, to subject known prostitutes to certified examination and confinement of diseased ones in special hospital, expense of which was paid from fund in custody of army officer served solely from fees charged for examination of fifty cents to two dollars, according to place of examination.

System has greatly reduced percentage of disability from this cause. Purely an army police measure, outside our jurisdiction; military necessity. Result better than futile attempts at total suppression in Oriental city of 300,000, producing greater evil.

Prostitutes, when known, are not permitted to land. Number deported. General moral condition of city greatly maligned.

In answer to Secretary Root's question whether houses of ill fame are "licensed, protected, or in any way encouraged by the authorities," Judge Taft telegraphs that they are not. He then goes on to admit substantially all the facts charged, and to defend them.

This telegram from Judge Taft, following close on the heels of the one of absolute denial from General MacArthur, shows the different senses in which words may be understood. In the eyes of General MacArthur and Judge Taft, a "permit" is not a license, and to have prostitutes regularly examined by army surgeons and furnished with official health certificates is not to protect or encourage prostitution. On this point not only the missionaries and the churches, but the common sense of the average citizen, will dissent. The two chief influences that deter men from vice have been roughly defined as "the fear of God and the fear of consequences." How can it fail to act as an encouragement to vice when the military authorities take the industry of prostitution under their official supervision, and announce to our young sol-

diers that they will try to make it as safe as possible for them to sin?

Judge Taft telegraphs that this official supervision of vice is a "military necessity." But it has never before been tolerated in connection with the American army. The best of the army men disapprove of it. Theodore Roosevelt writes: "I cannot sufficiently express my horror of the system." General Grant set his face against it when the attempt was made to introduce it in his time. The efforts made to hide the facts from the people at home show that those army officers who have introduced this measure in the Philippines knew it would incur strong disapproval. By Judge Taft's own acknowledgment, the system has been in operation for more than two years; yet the truth has only just become known in the United States. Every assertion, by missionaries or others, in regard to the matter has been met by disingenuous evasion or downright denial, until Secretary Root's telegram has at last wrung out a reluctant admission.

Judge Taft says, "The system has greatly reduced the percentage of disability from this cause." If so, the reduction must be very recent. "Regulation" of vice has been in force in the Philippines for more than two years. It is only a few months since Major Ira Brown, of the Military Board of Health, in an elaborate report to his superiors, acknowledged the frightful prevalence of maladies of this sort among the soldiers, but claimed that they contracted them not from the duly authorized official prostitutes, but from others, and argued that a great extension of the regulation system was necessary.

If official "regulation" of vice has led to an improved state of health in the Philippines, it would be the first time in history. Its advocates always claim that this will be the result, but the promised improvement never materializes. Paris, the head centre of the system, where rigid "regulation" has prevailed for more than a century, is scourged to a notorious extent by the class of maladies against which "regulation" is designed to guard. England repealed her regulation acts by a heavy Parliamentary majority, after 17 years' experience had proved them a complete sanitary failure, as well as a great source of demoralization. Almost every religious denomination in England has protested emphatically against the continuation of the system in some of the remote British dependencies where it still lingers. One of the latest utterances on this subject was by the English Catholic bishops.

Judge Taft telegraphs that the present system is "better than futile attempts at total suppression in an Oriental city of 300,000." That is not the question. It is one thing to recognize that prostitution cannot be totally suppressed; it is quite another for the United States military authorities to go into partnership in the business, and to give it their official supervision and practical sanction.

Rev. F. H. Morgan, a missionary of the Methodist Episcopal Board in Singapore, who went to the Philippines and personally investigated this matter, writes:

Do our people at home realize what this means—that their sons are taken from Christian homes in America, and brought

to the tropics, with all the seductive influences prevalent there, and under the sanction of their officers find everything made as easy as possible for them to live lives of impurity and vice; that our Christian government, through its representatives, provides every facility for such sin, and says by actions, if not by words, that it is necessary, and that a young man cannot be pure away from home?

It is no wonder that some American mothers who never wanted to vote before are now wishing for the ballot. Every one who disapproves of this discreditable innovation in United States army methods should write to his Congressmen on the subject, and also write to President McKinley as commander-in-chief, demanding that official complicity with vice shall cease. The following form of memorial has been used:

Whereas, The European system of State regulation of vice has been introduced into Manila by the U. S. army authorities, therefore

Resolved: That we earnestly protest against this action, for the following reasons:

1. To issue permits to houses of ill-fame is contrary to good morals, and must impress both our soldiers and the natives as giving official sanction to vice.

2. It is a violation of justice to apply to vicious women compulsory medical measures which are not applied to vicious men.

3. Official regulation of vice, while it lowers the moral tone of the community, everywhere fails to protect the public health. In Paris, the head centre of the system, rigid regulation has prevailed for more than a century, yet that city is scourged to a notorious degree by the class of maladies against which regulation is designed to guard, and the Municipal Council of Paris has repeatedly recommended its abolition. England tried it in her garrison towns, for the benefit of her soldiers and sailors, and repealed it by a heavy Parliamentary majority, after seventeen years' experience had proved it to be a complete sanitary failure, as well as a fruitful source of demoralization. It has been repealed throughout Switzerland, except in Geneva, and is the object of a strong and growing opposition in every country where it still prevails. State-licensed and State-supervised brothels are contrary to the spirit of American institutions, and in St. Louis, the only city of the United States that ever tried the system, it was abolished at the end of four years, with only one dissenting vote in the city council. The United States should not adopt a method that Europe is discarding, nor introduce in our foreign dependencies a system that would not be tolerated at home. We protest in the name of American womanhood; and we believe that this protest represents also the opinion of the best American manhood.

At the time when this memorial was drawn up, the U. S. military authorities in the Philippines were reported to be issuing permits to houses of ill fame. It is possible that the issuing of formal permits has been given up, in deference to the protests from the United States. But the core of the whole evil system of "regulation" is the compulsory medical examination and official health certificate. To retain this, the advocates of "regulation" will fight to the last gasp, and the doctors and surgeons who are reaping money profit from the examination fees will use every kind of special pleading to persuade the President that

the system has improved the soldiers' health.

In view of the possibility that the issuing of official permits may have ceased, it may be well to modify the paragraph on that subject to read as follows:

1. For government to assume the supervision and regulation of prostitution is contrary to good morals, etc.

WOMEN AND GOVERNMENT.

Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt said in a recent address:

Within the last hundred years the relationship of women to government has so entirely changed that one who has not had occasion to study and analyze the changes would scarcely recognize it. A hundred years ago it was a common saying that every man's house was his castle. It was his castle. The man always owned the castle. He owned everything in the castle. He even owned his wife's clothes, and her wedding ring. The common understanding of the world at that time was that the government was a function away over here on one side, and the home was a function away over here on the other, and that government had nothing to do with the home, nor the home with the government.

But the whole progress of this last century has been to put the home within the government, and the modern progress of government has been to interfere in regard to that home and its welfare at every moment of the day. To-day women own these castles as well as men. There are queens as well as kings within the castle. To day women occupy a position of individuality they did not possess a hundred years ago. But now, if a woman wishes to build a home, the government interferes and puts an indirect tax upon the lumber and nails with which she must build it, and upon the stone and brick. She is indirectly taxed upon the carpets and curtains and all the furniture. She is taxed upon everything she buys for the home, and upon almost every garment she wears, upon almost every article of food she eats. And more than this. Not only is the woman taxed in order to carry on other functions of government, but the progress of events has taken away from her many of the useful occupations in general use a hundred years ago, and has put them under the direct supervision of the government.

In those days it was the woman who prepared the meats for the family. To-day she must go to the public market or buy at the meat shop, and the government superintends it; and many and many a woman has met death within her own household because that meat shop has not been properly superintended by the government under which she lived. In New York, not more than a week ago, a man was arrested for selling horse meat, and still another for selling tainted meat. In the old times nearly every family had its cow. To-day we read on every side of death in the milk pail, and it is the milk business which, perhaps, is under the supervision of government to-day as is no other. In the olden days women made all the clothing for the family. To-day the clothes are made in factories, with all the evils of the sweat-shops attached, and their making is under the supervision of the government. If a woman is employed anywhere, the government superintends her. In every moment of the day, through every day of the week, the government is interfering with the individual and personal rights of a woman. In the olden days, whether a woman came into the world or whether she went out of it, she was attended only by friends and neighbors, and even on her

wedding day it was only a matter for those persons concerned. To-day, if the government never exercises any other personal supervision over the individual woman, it insists upon superintending her when she comes into the world, and when she goes out of it, and when she marries. To-day the government looks after its women, and interferes with them exactly as it interferes with men, because the home relations have changed, and the home is within the government.

I now ask you, gentlemen, if the time has not come when the woman has changed from the condition of a ward to a condition of intelligence, when she touches the government all the way along her life, and when the government touches her, if she should not have a share in it?

CALIFORNIA NOTES.

A bill, proposed by the Merchants' Exchange of Oakland, is now pending in the California Legislature to make the wife's separate property liable for "necessaries ordered by any member of the family." The Franchise Department, endorsed by the Executive Board of the W. C. T. U., has sent the following protest:

Whereas, the present laws of California give the husband "sole control of the community property, the same as his separate estate;"

Whereas, the husband has control of the earnings of the wife, and can dispose of them or of what she has bought with them, without her consent,

Resolved: That we protest against the Merchants' Exchange Bill, making the wife's separate property responsible "for necessities bought by any member of the family." So long as the husband has the wife's earnings, it is fair that he alone be held responsible for family necessities.

BALLOT VERSUS HATCHET.

The hatchet is the weapon of barbarism; the ballot is the one weapon of civilization. In governments where one half of the people are denied the ballot, that half have no legitimate means by which to enforce laws. The hatchet, or other revolutionary weapons, are their only resource.

In Kansas, since 1887, Mrs. Nation, with all the other women in the 286 cities of the State, have had the right to vote for Mayor, for the members of the Common Council, and for every other officer of the municipality. The same Legislature that gave women this right also passed a law giving the Governor the power to appoint, in the first and second class cities, three police commissioners to take charge of the enforcement of the laws for the suppression of saloons, brothels and gambling houses. The women soon learned that it made no difference for whom they voted. No city official could do aught to enforce the law. The saloon went scot free, whichever party was in power. The women had no political influence with the Governor, while every boot-legger, every jointist, every saloonist, and every mother's son, no matter how low, drunken or besotted, had a direct vote for him.

In 1899, after twelve years, the law giving the Governor power to appoint commissioners was repealed. Since then the cities of the first and second class have had the burden of the enforcement or non-enforcement of the laws thrown back into

the hands of the people. Topeka, Wichita, Atchison, Leavenworth and Kansas City now must take the praise or blame of their action, together with the whole 281 other cities of the State. Women equally with men have the responsibility. Therefore the duty of Mrs. Nation and all women of Kansas is to register and vote for such men only as will publicly pledge themselves to do their duty, and to carefully "spot" and retire to private life every officer who has failed to show his hand. By this process of weeding out the sympathizers with the saloon, and voting only for men or women true to principle, for two or three elections, the women would see the fruit of their labors, proving to themselves and to the world the power of the ballot over the hatchet.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY.

Miss Permeal French, whom Governor Steunenberg called the best State Superintendent of Public Instruction that Idaho had ever had, was reelected, as already mentioned in our columns; and women have also been elected Superintendents of Public Instruction in fifteen counties. In six counties women were elected county treasurers.

The Woman's Journal,

Founded by Lucy Stone, 1870.

A Weekly Newspaper, published every Saturday, at 3 Park Street, Boston, devoted to the interests of women.

EDITORS:

HENRY B. BLACKWELL,
ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

ASSISTANT EDITORS:
FLORENCE M. ADKINSON,
CATHARINE WILDE.

OCCASIONAL CONTRIBUTORS:

Julia Ward Howe, Mary A. Livermore, Mary Putnam Jacobi, M. D., Elizabeth Stuart Phelps Ward, Harriet Prescott Spofford, Dr. Emily Blackwell, Dr. Lelia G. Bedell, Alice Fletcher, Kate M. Gordon, Virginia D. Young, Prof. Ellen Hayes, Baroness Alexandra Gripenberg, Lida Calvert Obenchain, Ellis Meredith, and many others.

"The best source of information upon the woman question that I know."—*Clara Barton.*

"The best woman's paper in the United States or in the world."—*Englishwoman's Review.*

"It is an armory of weapons to all who are battling for the rights of humanity."—*Mary A. Livermore.*

"It is so much the best of the woman suffrage papers that no comparison is possible."—*Rev. Anna H. Shaw.*

"It is an exceedingly bright paper, and what is far better, a just one. I could not do without it."—*"Josiah Allen's Wife" (Marietta Holly).*

"THE WOMAN'S JOURNAL has long been my outlook upon the great and widening world of woman's work, worth and victory. It has no peer in this noble office and ministry. Its style is pure and its spirit exalted."—*Frances E. Willard.*

"It is the most reliable and extensive source of information regarding what women are doing, what they can do, and what they should do. It is the oldest of the women's papers now in existence, and has built up for itself a solid and unblemished reputation."—*Julia Ward Howe.*

The Yellow Ribbon Speaker

Equal Rights Readings and Recitations, in Prose and Verse, compiled by REV. ANNA H. SHAW, ALICE STONE BLACKWELL, and LUCY E. ANTHONY. For sale at WOMAN'S JOURNAL Office 3 Park St., Boston, Mass. Price, postpaid, 50 cents.

CITIZENSHIP FOR ALASKANS.

It has been commonly supposed that when the government could persuade Crazy Snake and his tribe of snakes and the rest of the Choctaws and Apaches and Digger Indians to exchange their tomahawks for ballots, everybody in the United States of the male gender would be enfranchised. It has been discovered, however, that up among the glaciers of Alaska there is a large body of males who, up to date, have taken no part in the government of the United States. It is singular that they should have been so long overlooked, but now no time will be lost in making them a part of the electorate.

The chairman of the Committee on Territories, William S. Knox, of Massachusetts, has introduced a bill providing for "the admission to citizenship of Alaskan natives now residing in that Territory, and their descendants, members of the uncivilized tribes." During the thirty-four years in which Alaska has been part of the United States, no one, not even the native himself, has felt any concern as to his citizenship.

When Chairman Knox of Massachusetts has succeeded in his laudable purpose, let us hope he will find time to cast his eyes in the direction of his own State in his search for the disfranchised. In not another section of the United States, perhaps, are there within the same area as many highly educated women; in none is there a larger proportion of women taxpayers. In no State have women been trying longer or more earnestly to secure the franchise.

How comes it, then, that he is so deeply concerned about the Esquimaux, and so utterly regardless of educated citizens of Massachusetts? If approached on this subject, he would probably make the hackneyed reply: "When the majority of women ask for the ballot, they will get it."

Have the majority of the Alaskan men asked for it? Have the various tribes of Indian men been enfranchised because the majority requested it? Did the majority of the Hawaiian men express a desire for it? Did a majority of the Porto Rican men insist upon being made voters? Is universal male suffrage provided for in the new Cuban Constitution because a majority of the men have petitioned for it? Is there in the whole history of our Government one—just one—instance where any class of men have had the franchise bestowed upon them because a majority demanded it? Not in one single case has this been done, and yet legislators, politicians, editors, ministers, lawyers, dismiss the plea of women for representation with the illogical remark: "When the majority ask for it, they can have it." If they are told that the petitions of the women of the United States for suffrage exceed those for this purpose of all the men in the country combined since the Government was founded, they simply answer: "The majority of women must ask for it." And then, when the hundreds of thousands who have asked for it and worked for it turn away in despair, the political drag-net is put forth again to gather in another catch of immigrants, Negroes, Indians, Hawaiians, Porto Ricans, and Esquimaux, whose sole qualification

for the exercise of the franchise lies in the accident of having been born of the masculine gender.

As women look upon this performance year after year, they may be pardoned if they repeat the prayer of Dr. Lyman Beecher: "O Lord, grant that we may not despise our rulers; and grant, O Lord, that they may not act so we can't help it!" —*Ida Husted Harper, in New York Sun.*

MISS ANTHONY'S BIRTHDAY.

Miss Anthony celebrated her eighty-first birthday quietly at her home in Rochester, N. Y., on Feb. 15. Her health did not permit of any unusual demonstration in her honor, but she was not forgotten. The *Rochester Union and Advertiser* says: "Miss Anthony was the recipient of many pleasant remembrances. One friend sent her two United States bonds worth \$1,200. Many congratulatory letters were received."

"Miss Anthony was delighted with the presents. She was unusually pleased with a splendid large bunch of roses and a thrifty palm from the 'co-eds' of the University of Rochester, who owe so much to her efforts in their behalf."

"To a reporter who asked her what her message to the world on her 81st birthday was, she replied: 'You may say that I consider myself as good as an Indian or a Hawaiian, and equally entitled to vote, and so my demand to-day is the same that it has been for the past fifty years: perfect equality of rights for women, political and civil.'"

DR. RYDER'S LECTURES.

Dr. Emily Brainerd Ryder, whose address on the "Child Wives of India" at the last Fortnightly aroused so much interest, is prepared to address clubs and other organizations on the many phases of life she has seen in the Orient. Her lectures include graphic accounts of "Life among the Hindoos," "The Fire Worshipers," "Followers of the True Prophet," and "Polynesia and Its Fascinating Island World." The picturesque garments of Oriental women are exhibited in connection with the lectures. She may be addressed at the *Woman's Journal* Office, 3 Park Street, Boston.

KANSAS NOTES.

A woman judge and clerk were selected to serve in each voting precinct in Kansas City at the primary election held Feb. 12. This is the first time in Kansas that women have been chosen for this position by the political parties having the selection of these officers. Perhaps this is intended as a rebuke to Mr. Butler, who has brought so much derision upon himself through his attempt to introduce a bill repealing municipal suffrage for women in Kansas. The *Topeka (Kan.) Journal* significantly asks:

Is there a motive underlying the rabid persistence of Representative Butler in his efforts to secure the repeal of municipal suffrage for women? In Topeka the influence of the women in the elections has always been the highest. They can be counted upon to stand for purity and honesty in the administration of public affairs. For this very reason they might be con-

sidered a dangerous factor in the political affairs of some cities; they might seriously interfere with the politicians and fixers. Have the women of Kansas City dared to cross Mr. Butler's path?

MISS GILBERT ILL.

Mrs. M. M. Gilbert, superintendent of parlor meetings for the Massachusetts W. S. A., is seriously ill. This is why letters sent to her about meetings have not been answered. Until she recovers, friends willing to open their parlors for meetings may correspond with the State headquarters at 3 Park Street in regard to speakers.

WHY WOMEN SHOULD VOTE.

Miss Maud Thompson said at a recent legislative hearing on equal suffrage:

One of the speakers against woman suffrage who appeared before the committee of the House of Representatives at Washington last February said women had gained so many rights in the last fifty years that they did not need the ballot. That reminds me of a man who is trying to climb out of a pit and succeeds in getting his head up into the light and air, and then is told he need not climb any farther,—"Just hang on and be happy." It is because we have got a taste of justice and liberty that we feel we never can stop until women and men have been placed upon an absolute political equality.

We are sometimes told that women do not need the ballot for self-protection, because the interests of men and women are identical. The interests of capital and labor are identical. It is a truism to say that the prosperity of capital is bound up with the prosperity of labor. Then why do the working men want to vote? Will not the capitalists attend to their mutual interests? No, it is with them as with the women; their interests are the same, but their needs are not identical. If so, there never would have been any laws against women. Women's interests have always been the same as men's, and they are the same to-day, but I think there is no one who will claim that in the past, at least, women's interests have received the same protection from the government as men's.

I want to call your attention to one other fact—that whenever the government becomes corrupt or inefficient, it is the people without votes who suffer. Last winter there was in New York City what might be called an epidemic of arresting respectable women, who afterward proved that they were innocent, and that they were abroad at night upon legitimate affairs. Yet those women were brought before the court, and their names published in the papers, with their addresses. The cases were dismissed, but they received no redress for the ignominy thrust upon them. Yet Broadway was infested with a class of men most obnoxious to women, and there never was but one man arrested for annoying women, and he was dismissed with a light reprimand. We ask the ballot to protect us against these occasional but actual acts of injustice, and still more to protect us against an honest but inevitable misunderstanding of our needs. We do not ask from the law any special protection, we ask only for means to protect ourselves.

The next lecture in the Fortnightly series will be given on Tuesday, Feb. 26, at 3 P. M., in the parlors of the *Woman's Journal*, 3 Park Street. Dr. Caroline E. Hastings will be the lecturer of the afternoon, and will talk on "The New Gospel of Health," as exemplified by the "No-Breakfast Plan."